

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

North Pine Nut Weed Treatment for Canada Thistle

DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0030-DNA

Sierra Front Field Office

Carson City

Nevada

89701

775-885-6000

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Worksheet

U.S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Sierra Front Field Office, LLNVC02000

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: N/A

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: North Pine Nut Weed Treatment for Canada Thistle

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Multiple locations within Bi-State sage-grouse habitats - Section 30, 29, 16, T.14N., R.23E., M.D.B.&M., on Churchill Canyon Allotment Section 13, T.14N., R.22E., M.D.B.&M., on Sunrise Allotment.

Other locations outside of Bi-State sage-grouse habitats, but serve as weed seed sources in the North Pine Nut Mountains, include Section 19, T.15N., R.21E., M.D.B.&M. in Brunswick Canyon, outside of a grazing allotment, and Section 26, T.15N., R.20E., M.D.B.&M, near Mexican Dam, and Section 31, T.16N., R.31E., M.D.B.&M.

Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures.

The purpose of this project is to treat small patches of less than 15 acres of the invasive weed, Canada Thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), with herbicide picloram, in order to reduce identified patch sizes to zero. Identified units cover a total of 70 acres in the North Pine Nut Mountains. Use of picloram during the flowering stage and in the fall works best for Canada Thistle, when plants occur away from surface water. If the plants are in standing water then an aquatic formulation of 2,4-D or glyphosate must be used. Follow up applications, as a result of monitoring, will occur until the goal is met. Expected time for implementation is estimated at 4—10 days to access all units.

Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name	Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan	Date Approved:	May 2001
----------	--	----------------	----------

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The Proposed Action described below is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (CRMP) (BLM 2001):

On page LSG-1:

“Maintain or improve the condition of the public rangelands to enhance productivity for all rangeland and watershed values;”

On page LSG-8:

“Application of herbicides...would be in accordance with procedures established in Bureau Manual 9222...to ensure non-impairment of other than target species.” and

On page WLD-2:

“Maintain and improve wildlife habitat, including riparian/stream habitats...”

“Maintain or improve the habitat condition of meadow and aquatic areas.”

“Maintain or improve the condition of the public rangelands so as to enhance productivity for all rangeland values (including wildlife).”

Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Name of Document: Carson City District, Integrated Weed Management Plan/Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment (IWMP/PEA)

Document No.: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0003-EA

Date of Approval: July 2015

Name of Document: Vegetation Treatments on BLM Lands in 17 Western States PEIS.

Date of Approval: June 2007

Name of Document: Vegetation Treatments on BLM Lands in 17 Western States ROD.

Date of Approval: September 2007

NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

The Proposed Action is in conformance within the applicable LUP and the Carson City District, IWMP/PEA (DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0003-EA). The proposed project is within the Carson City District. There are no substantial differences.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource value?

Under the IWMP/PEA, analysis for noxious weed treatments with BLM approved herbicides was discussed for infestations negatively affecting ecosystem and watershed health in general. The IWMP/PEA incorporated various best management practices in project planning, including prioritizing areas for treatment. The Proposed Action includes Bi-State sage-grouse habitats as a priority treatment area for the planning area. The IWMP/PEA also sited project planning considerations to cover treatment of sources of weed seed and propagules to prevent the spread of existing weeds and new weed infestations. Eldorado, Brunswick and Mexican Dam Canyons are treatment areas included in the Proposed Action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

The existing analysis in the IWMP/PEA (DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0003-EA) is valid in light of the herbicide choices for the Proposed Action is the same BLM approved chemicals referred to in the IWMP/PEA for the treatment of Canada Thistle in dry land or wetland environments. No new information new circumstances are present to substantially change the analysis of the new Proposed Action.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

The direct, indirect and cumulative effects from implementation of the Proposed Action are similar to those analyzed in the IWMP/PEA: treat invasive weeds when they are at a manageable size, before they are a dominant species in an area. For example, treating a patch of Canada Thistle the size of a hot tub

is easier to implement than treating 20 acres of Canada Thistle. Implementation will involve less exposure of the chemical, less labor, less time and fewer repeat treatments.

5. Are there public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Carson City District, Integrated Weed Management Plan/Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA/IWMP):

On April 28, 2014 this project was reviewed by the BLM's interdisciplinary team. Issues that were discussed during this meeting included:

How would site-specific treatments be addressed under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)?

How would compliance under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) be completed when site-specific locations are identified for treatment?

Additional meetings with the BLM's interdisciplinary team were held on January 26 and February 9, 2015.

On January 15 and 21, 2015 the BLM sent consultation initiation letters to all tribes that have affiliation with public lands in the CCD including: the Bridgeport Indian Colony; Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe; Lovelock Indian Colony; Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; Susanville Indian Rancheria; Walker River Paiute Tribe; Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California; Yerington Paiute Tribe; and Yomba Shoshone Tribe.

On May 18, 2015 the BLM initiated a 45-day public review and comment period. A news release announcing the comment period had been released by the BLM on May 15, 2015. The news release appeared High Beam (internet site) on May 15, 2015 and in the Reno Gazette-Journal on May 27, 2015. Letters were sent to 50 individuals, 34 organizations/companies, 10 tribes, and nine agencies including the Nevada State Clearinghouse on the project mailing list. The public comment period closed on July 1, 2015.


The BLM received eight comment letters or emails on the draft documents. Summarized responses are provided in Appendix F (of the IWMP/PEA), Comments and Responses to Comments.

BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Rachel Crews	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Dean Tonenna	Natural Resource Specialist	BLM sensitive plant species
Pilar Ziegler	Wildlife Biologist	BLM sensitive animal species

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.



Signature of Project Lead

Date 7/30/2015



Signature of Sierra Front Field Office NEPA Coordinator

Date 7/30/2015



Signature of Responsible Official
Sierra Front Field Office

Date 7-30-15

Leon Thomas

Note:

Sierra Front Field Manager

See accompanying Decision Record for appeal information.